

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are the claims currently pending in the Application.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-16, 19, 21, 22, 24-26, 29 and 30 are amended to clarify features recited thereby and to remove minor stylistic issues.

Formal Matters

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge the claim for foreign priority the receipt of the priority document.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging review and consideration of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 3, 2004.

Rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the ground for rejection amounts to no more than a ground for objection because it is at most a stylistic issue and the claim would have been readily understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art. However, to expedite prosecution of the Application, the claim is amended and therefore this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ludwig et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,915,091. This rejection is traversed.

Among the problems recognized and solved by Applicants' claimed invention is the coordination of the playback of a broadcast program, such as television broadcast program or a web cast content program, or the like, at several terminals at a time arbitrarily chosen by a user at a terminal.¹ According to an aspect of Applicants' claimed invention, a user at a terminal can set and cause to be transmitted to other terminals schedule data indicating when the playback of the broadcast program is to occur.

For at least the following reasons Applicants' claimed invention is neither anticipated by nor obvious from the cited reference. By way of example, independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21 and 26 require delivering schedule data for reproducing information on the display at a time arbitrarily selected by a user.

Ludwig discloses synchronization in videoconferencing using a multimedia collaborations system that integrates separate real-time and asynchronous networks (Ludwig, Abstract), such that in a data conferencing mode, a snapshot of a selected portion of a participant's screen, such as a window on the screen of a participant in teleconference, can be sent to the other participants' screens (Ludwig, column 26, lines 20-31), and such that a multimedia call or conference can be recorded and reproduced by synchronizing events associated with the video or audio stream at a specific frame number or time code (Ludwig, column 29, lines 7-10).

Ludwig does not disclose or suggest delivering schedule data for reproducing information on the display at a time arbitrarily selected by a user, as *inter alia* are required by

¹ This discussion illustrates problems recognized by aspects of Applicant's claimed invention. Applicant does not represent that every embodiment of Applicant's claimed invention necessarily embodies or performs the solutions herein discussed.

independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21 and 26. That is, Ludwig does not disclose or suggest that a user can specify an arbitrary time at which information is to be reproduced at a remote terminal.

Clearly, Ludwig does not disclose or suggest schedule data that may specify such an arbitrary time. In fact, Ludwig belongs to the prior art recognized by Applicants' claimed invention, because Ludwig does not deal with the above-identified problems recognized and solved by Applicants' claimed invention. For example, Ludwig does not address the coordination of the playback of a broadcast program, such as television broadcast program or a web cast content program, or the like, at several terminals at a time arbitrarily chosen by a user at a terminal. Therefore, Ludwig does not even remotely disclose or suggest the recitations of Applicants' invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21 and 26.

Claims 2-5 depend from independent claim 1, claims 7-10 depend from independent claims 6, claims 12-15 depend from independent claim 11, claims 17-20 depend from independent claims 16, claims 22-25 depend from independent claim 21, and claims 27-30 depend from independent claim 26. Therefore, claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20, 22-25 and 27-30 incorporate novel and non-obvious features of their respective base claims and are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that their respective base claims are patentably distinguishable the prior art. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn. therefore this rejection should now be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicants believe that the Application is now allowable, and respectfully request that the Examiner allow the Application. Should the

Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally,
the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "George Brieger".

George Brieger
Registration No. 52,652

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343 Ext. 503

GB:ae